



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,386	11/27/2001	Srikanth Sundararajan	24220-012	7267

7590 11/15/2004
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

EXAMINER

REAGAN, JAMES A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/994,386

Applicant(s)

SUNDARARAJAN, SRIKANTH

Examiner

James A. Reagan

Art Unit

3621

[Handwritten Signature]

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 27 November 2001.
2. Claims 1-11 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requires of this title.

4. Claim rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter. The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

(1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and

(2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

5. For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

6. In the present case, the recited steps of merely *defining components, static and dynamic relationships, permutations, and determining compatibility* do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed without the use of any technological apparatus, system or method such as, for example, a computer system, database, electronic circuit, or software application. These steps only constitute a method that is easily attainable without the use of any state-of-the-art devices or techniques.
7. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, no claim produces a useful, concrete, or tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah (US 6,256,773 B1) in view of Gounares et al. (US 6,282,527 B1).

Examiner's Note: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific

limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-11:

Bowman-Amuah teaches, " A system, method, and article of manufacture are provided for affording consistency in a development architecture framework as components in the framework change" (see at least the abstract). Bowman-Amuah also teaches the capability maturity model (CMM) (see at least column 24, lines 15-24), change and configuration management (see at least column 1, lines 20-22), version control and testing of software components (see at least column 26, lines 27-43), and testing, debugging and compiling cycles (see at least column 9, line 50), clearly disclosing the following limitations:

- *defining components of the distributed production environment;*
- *defining static and dynamic inter-relationships between components of the distributed production environment;*
- *determining compatibility of a component change based upon the defined static and dynamic inter-relationships and the permutations of dynamic inter-relationships;*
- *notifying an operator when a compatibility is not determined for a component change;*
- *determining a set of possible operations within the production environment;*
- *determining a plurality of orderings of the set of possible operations within the production environment; determining dynamic inter-relationships between components based upon each of the plurality of orderings;*
- *the set of possible operations includes processes in an e-commerce transaction;*

- *means for receiving an indication of a component change;*
- *means for determining compatibility of the component change based upon the static and dynamic inter-relationships stored in the database;*

Bowman-Amuah does not disclose *defining permutations of dynamic inter-relationships based upon possible operation flows*. Gounares, however, in at least column 1, lines 39-49 does. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the software development process of Bowman-Amuah with Gounares' iterative testing procedure because it is an accepted practice for analyzing, testing, and verifying the compatibility of software products in the software development industry.

Claims 2 and 8:

With regard to the limitations of:

- *preventing a component change for which a compatibility has not been determined;*
- *implementing a component change for which a compatibility has been determined;*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prevent an untested or faulty software component from being installed into an online transactional system, just as it would be obvious to apply a component that has been thoroughly tested to ensure proper operation of the transactional system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **James A. Reagan** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-9131**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **James Trammell** can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Receptionist** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> . Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 [Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(703) 308-1396 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED"

or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.

JAR

10 November 2004

